

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1956.

ators on Arms Shipments to Middle East



proval, of course, of the accuracy of your statements.

Do you think this last meeting which just ended, I believe, would indicate, or that the speeches of Khrushchev (Nikita S. Khrushchev, Soviet Communist party leader) and the other leaders in the Russian Government would indicate a failure in their foreign policy?

SENATOR DULLES—Absolutely, sir.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT—I would be most interested to hear why you think they indicate that.

SHIFT in Tactics Listed

SENATOR DULLES—All right, I will be glad to tell you. For thirty years, Soviet foreign policy and Soviet policy generally has been based upon two principles; namely, intolerance—not even non-Communist system; any system which did not conform to Soviet communism, because there are

less in heavy industry and in the war industries. There they are putting all their emphasis, and they are very successful in that respect.

I said, taking their industry as a whole, there are glaring weaknesses, particularly in the field of agriculture.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT—They offered to build the Aswan Dam. They have offered a hundred million dollars to Afghanistan, which has accepted, apparently. They are making offers of Point Four around various areas which—how do you interpret those offers?

Training Methods Cited

SENATOR DULLES—I interpret them in this way, Senator.

First, their offers are in terms of the particular things where they do have surpluses. They do have surplus, particularly in the form of technicians. They have trained hundreds of

the Baghdad Pact because geographically it is part of the northern tier area which you can see on the map which is behind you.

Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Pakistan form part of that northern tier, the concept of which I developed when I was out in the Near East and Middle East three years ago.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT—You think military danger is the greater danger from Russia, or is it competitive co-existence?

SENATOR DULLES—I think that the lesser danger, certainly at the moment, is the military danger, assuming that we maintain a capacity on our part to be strong and to make aggression a nonpaying proposition. I believe we are in that position.

SENATOR ALEXANDER SMITH (Republican of New Jersey)—If that is true, I am somewhat puzzled to understand why we drifted along since 1951 until 1955 to go ahead with those shipments of arms; and, unfortunately the shipment comes just at a moment when we have developed or there has developed this tenseness in the Middle East.

Why was that material not sent long ago?

SENATOR DULLES—Because it was not ordered, Senator, until quite recently. There have been some fairly substantial orders from Saudi Arabia over the past four or five years; that is, as I mentioned before, Saudi Arabia is the only country in the area which bought any substantial amount of arms from the United States.

But this particular order for the tanks did not come in until shortly before the licenses were granted, last September.

I would like, Senator, if I might, just to point out the fact that tanks which go to the port of Bahrain, where those tanks are going, which is on the east coast of Saudi Arabia, cannot get physically to Israel. There is no problem here about those tanks ever being used against Israel, because the desert makes them impassable for those tanks.

Declaration Policy Cited

SENATOR SMITH—I think that is a very important point, because of course, the question has been raised, if we send tanks to Saudi Arabia, why should we not send corresponding equipment to Israel.

SENATOR DULLES—We have made it our policy, as an application of the 1950 Declaration, to avoid sending arms in general to those countries, either Israel or any neighbors of Israel. That policy we were prepared to modify in the case of Egypt under very special circumstances where we felt otherwise they would get the arms from the Soviet Union, where in fact our proposal fell through.

But in general we have felt the problem of Israel and its Arab neighbors was not in any way involved with the shipment of arms to Saudi Arabia, because things like tanks cannot get across the desert.

SENATOR SMITH—Can I ask you this further question: Have the actual shipments of Czech arms to Egypt been of a magnitude sufficient to overcome the military position which Israel has heretofore had over the Arab states?

SENATOR DULLES—Certainly it will alter the relationship materially to the disadvantage of Israel. We do not know precisely what the make-up of this arms deal is, which has tried to be kept very secret and has been kept very secret, so we do not know the details about what the arms shipment has been. But we do know enough to feel that it will add very materially to the strength of Egypt after a period of time.

It will take time for the Egyptians to assimilate and learn to use these new weapons which they are getting. So that there has not, I think, been any shift in the military balance up to the present time, but that could come about within a matter of some months.

SENATOR SMITH—Well, then, may I ask you this question: What is our present thinking in the State Department with regard to the Israel application to buy \$50,000,000 worth of arms? Are we holding up to see what the strength of this Czech shipment to Egypt is?

SENATOR DULLES—We are not holding it up primarily on that account, although that is, of course, a factor in the matter. We are holding it up because we do not believe that, taking all the factors into account, the shipment would be conducive to the bringing about of the only solution which is worth while—that is a permanent peace between Israel and the Arab states. That is the thing we are working on very actively.

That was the subject of a very carefully thought-out address which I made on the 26th of August, and we believe that in the future of Israel, in the long run, must depend upon the development of a peaceful, agreed relationship with its Arab neighbors.

If that cannot be achieved, then Israel has only a very difficult existence ahead of it.

Therefore, we try to measure what we do in terms of whether it will help permanently to solve the problem; and as long as we think there is a hope of getting a permanent solution of the problem, we do not want to destroy that hope by doing something which could only be, at best, of ephemeral value.

Possibility of Attack Raised

SENATOR SMITH—What is our responsibility to prevent an attack, either by Israel on Egypt or Egypt on Israel, or Israel on Syria?

SENATOR DULLES—The preservation of the State of Israel, as I said before, is what I regard as one of the essential goals of United States foreign policy. It is a not, of course, our only goal, and we have to combine the search for that result with the achievement of other results which are also important

DEMOCRAT SCORE DULLES' OPTIMISM ON SOVIET THREAT

FEB. 26, 1956

See 'Complacency' in View That Strength of West Alters Moscow Tactics

ABSD, HUMPHREY SAYS

Fulbright Finds Reversal—Stevenson Holds Secretary Might Mislead Nation

Excerpts from Dulles hearing appear on Pages 52 and 53.

By JAMES RESTON
Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25.—The foreign policy of the United States was deeply entangled in a bitter partisan debate today over the significance of the Soviet Union's new political and economic offensive in Asia and the Middle East.

Secretary of State Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that Western strength had forced Moscow to adopt more moderate policies. Thus, he contended, Moscow's shift of emphasis from violence to economic and political action in the underdeveloped nations of the world is evidence of the success and strength of Allied policies and of the weakness and failure of Soviet policies.

This produced a torrent of criticism and ridicule from leading Democrats today. Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota characterized Mr. Dulles' remarks as "absurd." The new Soviet tactics, he observed, indicate no Soviet danger because they "supplement" the tactics followed by Moscow before.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, another member of the Foreign Relations Committee, recalled that Mr. Dulles, with the concurrence of President Eisenhower, called on the country last month to "wake up" to the dangers of the new Soviet offensive.

'Complacent' View Challenged

"Now the Secretary seems to be fairly complacent about the struggle with the Russians," Senator Fulbright said. "This contradiction is confusing."

In Hartford, Conn., Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois said in a telephone conversation that he was surprised to read the Secretary of State's interpretation of the new Soviet policy.

"Surely he knows better," Mr. Stevenson remarked today, "if he doesn't he should; and if he does, he should not mislead the country."

In Albany, Gov. Averell Harriman said: "There is no evidence that the Kremlin's objective of world domination has changed in the slightest. For the Secretary of State to suggest that the Soviets are changing their system is reckless, because it can only contribute further to the unjustified complacency which President Eisenhower and

Continued on Page 31, Column 1